



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *106th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2000

Senate

WTO and National Security

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, first, let me acknowledge the leadership of my colleagues from Georgia and Kansas for bringing attention and focus to an area that does not often get appropriate focus. It is about international affairs—the connecting rods to our lives in a world now that is, in fact, globally connected.

That global community is underpinned by a global economy. There is not a dynamic of the world today, not an action taken nor a consequence of that action, that does not affect America, that does not affect our future. I am grateful that Senators Cleland and Roberts have taken the time and the leadership to focus on an area of such importance to our country.

I point out an op-ed piece that appeared in Monday's Washington Post, written by Robert Kagan, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 2000

A World of Problems . . .

Call me crazy, but I think it actually would serve the national interest if George W. Bush spent more time talking about foreign policy in this campaign. Not to slight the importance of his statements on the environment and the census. But perhaps Bush and his advisers can find time to pose a simple, Reaganesque question: Is the world a safer place than it was eight years ago?

A hundred bucks says even James Carville can't answer that question in the affirmative—

at least not with a straight face. A brief tour of the horizon shows why.

IRAQ

As the administration enters its final months, Saddam Hussein is alive and well and Baghdad, pursuing his quest for weapons of mass destruction, free from outside inspection and getting wealthier by the day through oil sales while the sanctions regime against him crumbles. The next president may see his term dominated by the specter of Saddam Hussein.

THE BALKANS

You can debate whether things are getting better in Bosnia, or whether Kosovo is on its way to recovery or to disaster. And Clinton deserves credit for intervening in both crises. But Slobodan Milosevic is still in power in Belgrade, still stirring the pot in Kosovo and is on the verge of starting his fifth Balkan war in

Montenegro. Milosevic was George Bush Sr.'s gift to Bill Clinton; he will be Clinton's gift to Al Gore or George Jr.

CHINA-TAIWAN

Even Sinologists sympathetic to the Clinton administration's policies think the odds of military conflict across the Taiwan Strait have increased dramatically. Meanwhile, the administration's own State Department acknowledges the steady deterioration of Beijing's human rights record. Good luck to Al Gore if he tries to call China policy a success.

WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Two years after India and Pakistan exploded nuclear devices, their struggle over Kashmir re-

mains the likeliest spark for the 21st century's first nuclear confrontation. If this is the signal failure of the Clinton administration's nonproliferation policies, North Korea's and Iran's weapons programs come in a close second and third. Even the administration's intelligence experts admit that the threat to the United States has grown much faster than Clinton and Gore anticipated. And where is the missile defense system to protect Americans in this frightening new era?

HAITI AND COLOMBIA

After nobly intervening in Haiti to restore a democratically elected president in 1994, the administration has frittered away the past 5 1/2 years. Political assassinations in Haiti are rife. Prospects for stability are bleak. Meanwhile, the war in Colombia rages, and even a billion-dollar aid program may not prevent a victory by narco-guerrillas. When the next president has to send troops to fight in Colombia or to restore order in Haiti, again, he'll know whom to thank.

RUSSIA

Even optimists don't deny that the election of Vladimir Putin could be an ominous development. The devastation in Chechnya has revealed the new regime's penchant for brutality. Add to all this the decline of the armed forces—even the Joint Chiefs complain that the defense budget is tens of billions of dollars short—and you come up with a story of failure and neglect. Sure, there have been some successes: NATO expansion and, maybe, a peace deal in Northern Ireland. Before November, Clinton could pull a rabbit out of the hat in the Middle East. But Jimmy Carter had successes, too. They did not save him from being painted as an ineffectual world leader in the 1980 campaign.

Bush maybe gun-shy about playing up foreign policy after tussling with John McCain in the primaries. But Gore is no McCain. He is nimble on health care and education, but he is clumsy on foreign policy. Bush may not be a foreign policy maven, but he's got some facts on his side, as well as some heavy hitters. Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, Goerge Shultz and Rich-

ard Lugar, instead of whispering in W.'s ear, could get out in public and help build the case. John McCain could pitch in, too.

The offensive can't start soon enough. The administration has been adept at keeping the American people in a complacent torpor: Raising the national consciousness about the sorry state of the world will take time. And if Bush simply waits for the next crisis before speaking out, he will look like a drive-by shooter. Bush also would do himself, his party and the country a favor if he stopped talking about pulling U.S. troops out of the Balkans and elsewhere. Aside from such talk being music to Milosevic's ears, Republicans in Congress have been singing that neo-isolationist tune for years, and the only result has been to make Clinton and Gore look like Harry Truman and Dean Acheson.

Some may say it's inappropriate to 'politicize' foreign policy. Please. Americans haven't witnessed a serious presidential debate about foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. Bush would do everyone a service by starting such a debate now. He might even do himself some good. Foreign policy won't be the biggest issue in the campaign, but in a tight race, if someone bothers to wake the people up to the world's growing dangers, they might actually decide that they care.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. Kagan is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He echoes what Senators Roberts and Cleland have talked about; that is, the vital interests of our country in world affairs. He suggests that America's two Presidential candidates this year, Governor Bush and Vice President Gore, focus attention in the remaining months of this Presidential campaign on international issues. He lays out a number of areas in the world that are of vital consequence and concern to not only those particular regions but to the United States.

The point is, others are coming to the same conclusions and realizations as our friends from Georgia and Kansas: that international relations

is the completeness of all of our policies—trade, national security, economy, geopolitics. It is, in fact, a complete policy.

We are living in a most unique time in history, a time when everything is possible. We live in a time when we can do more good for mankind than ever in the history of the world. Why is that? It deserves some perspective and some review.

Over the last 50 years, it has been the multilateral organizations of the world, beginning with the visionary and foresighted leadership of Harry Truman after World War II and a Republican Congress, working jointly to develop and implement multilateral policies and organizations such as the United Nations, such as what was born at Breton Woods, the IMF, the World Bank, trade organizations, multilateral peace, financial organizations—all are imperfect, all are flawed. But in the real world, as most of us understand, the choice is seldom between all good, the easy choice, and all bad. Normally our foreign policy and every dynamic of that foreign policy, be it foreign aid, be it national security interests, be it geopolitical interests, falls somewhere between all good and all bad. It is a difficult position to have to work our way through.

With this weekend's upcoming annual meetings for the IMF and the World Bank and the number of guests who will be coming to Washington—I suspect not exactly to celebrate the IMF and the World Bank and the World Trade Organization and other multilateral organizations—it is important that we bring some perspective to the question that fits very well into the larger question Senators Roberts and Cleland have asked; that is, is the world better off with a World Trade Organization, with a world trade regime, its focus being to open up markets, break down barriers, allow all nations to prosper? And how do they prosper? They prosper through free trade. Underpinning the free trade is individual liberty, individual freedom, emerging democracies, emerging markets.

We could scrap the World Trade Organization, 135 nations, and go back to a time, pre-

World War II, that essentially resulted in two world wars, where there would be no trading regime. Those countries that are now locked in poverty have to go it on their own. That is too bad. We can scrap the World Trade Organization. While we are at it, have the IMF and the World Bank added to any prosperity in the world? Have they made mistakes? Yes.

Let's examine some of the underlying and most critical and realistic dynamics of instability in the world. We do know that when there is instability, there is no prosperity and there is no peace. What causes instability?

Let's examine what it is that causes instability. When you have nations trapped in the cycle of hopelessness and the perpetuation of that cycle because of no hope, no future, poverty, hunger, pestilence, what do we think is going to happen? History is rather complete in instructing us on this point: conflict and war. When there is conflict and war, is there an opportunity to advance the causes of mankind? No. Why is that? Let's start with no trading. There are no markets. Do we really believe we can influence the behavior of nations with no contact, no engagement, no trade? I don't think so.

As many of our guests who are arriving now in Washington, who will parade up and down the streets, burning the effigies of our President and the Congress and the World Trade Organization and the IMF and the World Bank—and I believe sincerely their motives are pure; that they wish to pull up out of abject poverty the more than 1.5 billion people in the world today, which is a worthy, noble cause—I think the record over the last 50 years is rather complete in how that has been done to help other nations over the last 50 years do that a little differently than tearing down the multilateral institutions that have added to prosperity and a better life and a hope for mankind.

I will share with this body a couple of facts from the 1999 Freedom House survey. Most of us know of the organization called Freedom House. It issued its first report in 1978. This is what Freedom House issued on December 21,

1999: 85 countries out of 192 nations today are considered free. That represents 44 percent of the countries in the world today. That is the second largest number of free countries in the history of man. That represents 2.34 billion people living in free countries with individual liberties, 40 percent of all the people in the world. Fifty-nine countries are partly free, 31 percent of the countries. That represents 1.5 billion people living in partly free countries, 25 percent of the world's population.

What are the real numbers? Seventy-five percent of the countries, largest in the history of mankind, are living in either free or partly free countries. Forty-eight countries not free. That represents 25 percent of the population of the world.

What does that mean? Let's go back and examine about 100 years ago where the world was. At the turn of the century, no country on Earth, including the United States, had universal suffrage. Less than 100 years ago, the United States did not allow women to vote, and there were other human rights violations we accepted in this country. My point is, the United States must be rather careful not to moralize and preach to the rest of the world. Yes, we anchor who we are on the foundation of our democracy and equal rights, but it even took America 250 years to get as far as we have come.

So we should, if nothing else, at least be mindful of that as we dictate to other countries. Now, as we examine a number of the points that have been made this morning and will be made throughout the next few months about foreign policy, it is important for us to have some appreciation and lend some perspective to not only the tremendous progress that has been made in the world today, and the hope we have for tomorrow, and the ability and the opportunities we have to make the world better—and it is fundamentally about productive capacity, individual freedoms, trade, free markets, private investment, rule of law, rights, contract law, all that America represents, all that three-fourths of the world countries and population represent. It is solutions, creative solutions, for which we are looking.

Creative solutions will come as a result of imaginative and bold leadership. As I have said often when I have been challenged about America's role in the world and is America burdening itself with too much of a role—incidentally, what should our role be? That is a legitimate debate. But I have said this: America has made its mistakes. But think of it in this context. If America decides that its burden is too heavy, whether that be in the area of contributions to the United Nations, to NATO, wherever we are around the world, as an investment, we believe in markets, in freedom, in opportunity, in less war, less conflict, a future for our children, for whatever reason, if we believe we are too far extended—and that is a legitimate question—and we will have an ongoing dynamic debate on the issue and we should remind ourselves of this—the next great nation on earth—and there will be a next great nation if America chooses to recede back into the cold, gray darkness of mediocrity—that next great, powerful nation may not be quite as judicious and benevolent with its power as America has been with our power. That is not the world that I wish my 7-year-old and 9-year-old children to inherit. If there is an additional burden—and there is—for America to carry on to be the world's leader, for me, it is not only worthy of the objective to continue to help all nations and raise all nations' opportunities, but realistically, geopolitically, it is the only answer for the kind of world that we want not just for our children but for all children of the world.

So rather than tear down organizations and tear down trade regimes and tear down organizations that are focused on making the world better, we should ask our friends who are coming to Washington this week to give us creative solutions and be part of those creative solutions.

Mr. President, I am grateful for an opportunity to share some thoughts and hopefully make a contribution to what my friend from Georgia and my friend from Kansas have been about today and earlier in our session. This will continue throughout this year because through this education and this information and this exchange of

thoughts and ideas we will fundamentally broaden and deepen the foundation of who we are as a free nation and not be afraid of this debate in front of the world. It is the debate, the borderless challenges of our time—terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, the scourge of our time, illegal drugs—that must be confronted and

dealt with as a body of all nations, all peoples. Understanding and dealing with these fundamental challenges and issues are in the common denominator, mutual self-interest of all peoples.

Again, I am grateful for their leadership. I yield the floor.